

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.		FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/827,296		04/20/2004	Michael B. Zemel	31894-202098	2568	
26694	7590	06/21/2006		EXAM	EXAMINER	
VENABL			WEBMAN, EDWARD J			
P.O. BOX 34385 WASHINGTON, DC 20045-9998				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
	,			1616		
				DATE MAILED: 06/21/200	DATE MAILED: 06/21/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Office Action Commence	10/827,296	ZEMEL ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Edward J. Webman	1616	
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence ad	ddress
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tirr rill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	I. tely filed the mailing date of this of (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
 Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>04 Ap</u> This action is FINAL. Since this application is in condition for alloward closed in accordance with the practice under E 	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro		e merits is
Disposition of Claims			
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) 5, 8, 12, 13, 15 is/are 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-4,6,7,9-11 and 14 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	withdrawn from consideration.		
Application Papers			
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access applicant may not request that any objection to the orange Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction of the orange and the correction is objected to by the Examiner.	epted or b) objected to by the Edrawing(s) be held in abeyance. See on is required if the drawing(s) is obj	37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 C	• •
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priori application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	s have been received. s have been received in Application ity documents have been received (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No d in this National	Stage
Attachment(s) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary		
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) B) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 4/4/06.	Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal Pa 6) Other:		O-152)

Application/Control Number: 10/827,296

Art Unit: 1616

Applicant's election of coronary artery disease in the reply filed on 4/4/06 is acknowledged. Because applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out any errors in the restriction requirement, the election has been treated as an election without traverse (MPEP § 818.03(a)).

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-4, 6-8, 10, 11, 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Summerbell et al (BMJ 317 1998 p. 1487-89).

Summerbell et al teach weight loss in obese patients on a diet comprising milk or yoghurt (abstract, p. 1488 under "milk only").

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to formulate a high calcium diet for obese patients to achieve the beneficial effect of a reduction in body fat content in view of the Summerbell et al.

As to the particular claimed dosage frequency and amount, optimum parameters may be obtained by routine experimentation. In re Boesch 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980). One of ordinary skill will recognize that reduction in body fat content is a consequence of lipolysis of fat. One of ordinary skill, even the layman, recognizes that

Application/Control Number: 10/827,296 Page 3

Art Unit: 1616

obesity is a risk factor for coronary artery disease, and, therefore, loss of weight will reduce the risk of this disease.

Applicant argue that Summerbell et al teach away from a milk only diet, but rather diet rotation. However, that diet rotation would include the milk only diet or the theoretically superior milk plus diet. Applicants do not exclude diet rotation nor do they exclude a milk plus diet. Applicants argue that Summerbell et al do not address health problems, however, the obvious method does. Applicant argues unexpected results. However, Summerbell et al, prior to applicant's effective date, disclose reduction of body fat content by ingestion of calcium. Applicant argues extensive experimentation, however, applicants do not demonstrate that the dosages are critical or that the experinAppliationts cobjete the item to the composition of the composi the statement that a reduction in body fat content is a consequence of lipolysis of fat in adipocytes, the examiner cites US 6,716,810 column 17 lines 29-48, wherein the inventors refer to fat stores metabolized from peripheral adipose tissue by stimulation of lipolysis from adipocytes. As to the statement that obesity is a risk factor for coronary heart disease, the examiner cites the first sentence in "Objective:" in Eisenstein et al available on the internet. As to the fact that the claimed foods are well known to contain calcium the examiner refers to Table 2 from the NIH fact sheet on calcium available on the internet.

Claims 1-4, 6-11, 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Metz et al (AJH 1:58-60 1988).

Application/Control Number: 10/827,296

Art Unit: 1616

Metz et al teach a reduction in body fat content in rats consuming higher diets of calcium (abstract).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to formulate a high calcium diet for humans to achieve the beneficial effect of a reduction in body fat content in view of the Metz et al results.

As to the particular claimed dosage frequency and amount, optimum parameters may be obtained by routine experimentation. In re Boesch 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980). One of ordinary skill will recognize that reduction in body fat content is a consequence of lipolysis of fat in adipocytes. One of ordinary skill, even the layman, recognizes that obesity is a risk factor for coronary artery disease, and, therefore, loss of weighbalitatetsusenthethisk bletziertisteasehes both calcium and sodium ions. However, applicants do not exclude sodium. Applicants argue that sodium is implicated in coronary heart disease, but provide no support for the proposition. Applicants argue unexpected results, however, Metz et al, prior to applicant's effective date, disclose that a diet high in calcium causes a reduction in body fat. Applicants also object to the examiner's reliance on determining applicant's dosage by routine experimentation and the examiner's taking of official notice, however, the examiner's response to these objections is incorporated herein from the rejection over Summerbell et al supra as it relates Ap Meanes alubmissions discussed on pages 12-13 may demonstrate recognition by the public that the invention has the utility claimed. However, the issue at hand is non-obviousness.

No claims allowed.

Application/Control Number: 10/827,296 Page 5

Art Unit: 1616

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Edward J. Webman whose telephone number is 571-272-0633. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F from 8 AM to 5 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, J. Richter, can be reached on 571-272-0646. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

EDWARD J. WEBMAN PRIMARY EXAMINER GROUP 1500